

**Food Stamp Management Evaluation Schedule
October, 2005- September, 2006**

Site	Date	Type of Evaluation
Metro	October, 2005	Follow-up Monitoring
Spanish Fork	November, 2005	Follow-up Monitoring
Roy	December, 2005	Follow-up Monitoring
Midvale	February, 2006	Comprehensive Management Evaluation
Blanding	March, 2006	Comprehensive Management Evaluation
Brigham City	April, 2006	Comprehensive Management Evaluation
American Fork	May, 2006	Comprehensive Management Evaluation
West Valley	June, 2006	Comprehensive Management Evaluation
Richfield	July, 2006	Comprehensive Management Evaluation
Midvale	July, 2006	Follow-up Monitoring
Richfield	August, 2006	Follow-up Monitoring
Brigham City	September, 2006	Follow-up Monitoring

The FY2006 plan includes comprehensive reviews and follow-up monitoring as an integral part of the evaluation process. The timeframe incorporated into an ME is five months from the initial on-site to the follow-up on-site. Time intervals are as follows:

- Initial on-site visit
- Initial Findings Report – 30 days after on-site
- Response Report from EC – 30 days from receipt of Initial Report
- Follow-up on-site visit – 90 days from receipt of Response Report

This span of time allows the employment center to stop, start or change a process from either a required action or recommendations established through the ME findings. This also allows the Employment Center time to monitor and make modifications where necessary.

The comprehensive evaluation sites were assessed and selected using criteria consistent with Waiver No. 2037009 which allows Utah to select sites based on special circumstances or ‘red flags’. The red flag criteria considered for 2006 are as follows:

- a) Food Stamp Issuance Timeliness
- b) Negative Quality Control Reports
- c) Supervisory Negative Edits Reports

Other factors also considered but not used as red flag criteria:

- a) Civil Rights/Equal Opportunity
- b) Date of Discovery timeliness

- c) Customer Service Survey
- d) Recipient Claims Reports
- e) Grass Roots interviews

Some of the criteria used are also listed in the National Priority Areas FY2006 pertaining to State Agency Operation Reviews and Management Evaluations. Following are the target areas and a general description of the method to be used for Utah's Management Evaluations:

Utah Management Evaluation Plan

Target Areas FFY2006

1. Program Access	Method
Observance of office functions.	<p>Determine how accessible the program is to people who walk into the office. The following steps should occur in order to determine the office pathway:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When you walk in, how are you directed to find out where to pick up an application? (Signs, staff, etc) 2. Who is the first point of contact? 3. What is the office workflow of where you are sent? 4. When are you scheduled an appointment? 5. When are you able to get an EBT card? (Beginning participation in the food stamp program) 6. What, if any, barriers did you face while going through this process? (Long wait times, confusing pathway, not sure where to go, had to talk to an extreme amount of people, etc) <p>Rationale: This method allows the evaluation team to determine what, if any, barriers could be prohibiting people from participating in the Food Stamp Program (FSP). This follows the established process the Regional office uses when they look at Program Access for the state.</p>
Timeliness	Determine if the processing of food stamp cases is a barrier to customers participating in the program. Review timeliness for both

	<p>expedited and regular processing of food stamp cases for that center for the previous 6 months. This information can be retrieved from the YODA Program Timeliness – Office Summary” report.</p> <p>Interview staff, including management to determine reasons for untimely cases. Find out if this information is being shared among the staff and what actions are being taken on untimely cases. 25 initial applications will also be edited to see what, if any barriers exist in accessing the program as it pertains to the application process.</p> <p>Rationale: In the national priority areas for MEs, under Program Access, it states, “initial applications should be reviewed”. The main area of concern, as it relates to Program Access, would be in how long a customer would have to wait until they receive their benefits. This data is available in YODA. The supervisors are also determining why the cases are not timely by reviewing the untimely cases.</p> <p>Timeliness is a measure of what processes or procedures are being used in an office to issue food stamps. If timeliness is good, then the processes being used are working, and if timeliness is not good, then something is wrong in the way the cases are being processed. Root causes can be determined by checking the office workflow of how an individual gets from the front door to an application and appointment. For example if the appointment were set 2-3 weeks out, then it is probable that timeliness would be bad.</p>
--	--